REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-19, 21 and 22 are pending. Claims 1-14 and 20 have been cancelled without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification as requiring a statement of the claim of priority to two Japanese patent applications. The Examiner has also suggested a change in the title of the invention. Applicants have amended the specification to adopt these changes as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 14, 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,532,645 (hereinafter "Becherucci"). Applicants have cancelled Claim 14.

Becherucci teaches holding a core member which has only one tooth with one jig. Claim 19 has been amended to require a configuration wherein a core member having a plurality of teeth is held by a plurality of jigs. Thus, Becherucci does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 19, as amended, and claims dependent therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Becherucci in view of U.S. Patent application publication No. 2004/0113511 (hereinafter "Schmidt").

Claim 19, as amended, requires a core member with a plurality of teeth, which is held with a plurality of jigs prior to assembly. The plurality of jigs include at least a first and a second jig. The first and second jigs are arranged on opposite sides of the core member and each holds a different tooth. In this state, the core member held by the jigs is rotated about a rotation axis along the extending direction of at least one of the teeth thereby winding the wire forming the coil about the one tooth, as described in the specification at page 16, lines 1 to 8 and page 28, lines 3 to 11 and in reference to Figures 5 and 10. Thus, the core member is steadily rotated and the wire is stably wound, improving the productivity of the core motor.

As noted above, Becherucci merely discloses holding a core member, which has only one tooth, with one jig. Schmidt discloses a two-part rotor structure in which the teeth of each rotor core member are spaced far apart at equal angular intervals to facilitate the winding process due to the large distance between the poles or teeth. But Schmidt does not disclose a method of winding a wire. Thus, the only method of winding a wire in the combined references is the method taught by Becherucci and, even if that method is applied to the device of Schmidt, the method required by Claim 19, as amended, is not obvious as the combined references do not teach all of the limitations of Claim 19.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Becherucci. Applicants have amended Claim 18 to depend from Claim 19. As noted above,

Becherucci does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 19, as amended, and therefore Claim 18 is not obvious over Becherucci.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Becherucci in view of Schmidt. Applicants have amended Claims 15 and 17 to depend from Claim 19. As noted above, the combination of Becherucci and Schmidt does not render obvious Claim 19, as amended.

Additionally, with respect to Claim 15, the claim requires that each core member include two teeth located on the rotation axis, and wherein the core member is rotated while each of the two teeth is held by the corresponding jig. In this configuration, the core member is more steadily rotated and the wire is more stably wound. Further, since each core member of the present invention has two teeth that are located on the rotation axis, wires can be would about at least two teeth once the core member is properly held. Because the core member of Becherucci only has one tooth, all the core members need to be held a number of times equal to the number of all the teeth of the motor cores to wind wires around all the teeth of the motor cores. Schmidt has no bearing on this distinction between Becherucci and the instant invention as Schmidt does not teach a method of winding and therefore, the method of instant Claim 15 is not obvious in view of Becherucci and Schmidt.

Additionally, with respect to Claim 17, the claim requires that each core member includes two teeth located on the rotation axis and wherein the corresponding wires are simultaneously wound about the two teeth, respectively. This doubles the speed at which the wires are wound about the teeth of the core member compared to a configuration in which the wire is consecutively wound about one of the teeth at a time. Thus, the configuration recited by Claim 17

further improves the productivity of the motor core. Neither Becherucci nor Schmidt alone or together teach or suggest the configuration required by Claim 17.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: Robert D. Traver

Robert D. Traver
Registration No. 47,999
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: 7 MARCH 2005